MORACEAE, HIPPOCASTANACEAE ET VITACEAE, NOMINA CONSERVANDA

ALFRED REHDER

Comparatively little attention has been paid to names of families and their validity under the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. The only proposal for the conservation of names of families is the list of 186 names proposed by J. Lanjouw and T. A. Sprague on pp. 64–65 of the Synopsis of Proposals concerning Nomenclature prepared by T. A. Sprague and submitted to the Sixth International Botanical Congress at Amsterdam in 1935. This list was voted upon at the Congress and adopted without change (see Proc. Sixth Intern. Bot. Congr. 1: 358. 1936). The list, however, contains only names employed by Bentham and Hooker f., Genera Plantarum, and also some by Engler & Gilg, Syllabus der Pflanzenfamilien (ed. 9 & 10), formed according to Art. 23 of the Rules and the few exceptions conserved under Art. 23, Exceptions (1) and (3). The conservation of additional names was left by the last Botanical Congress to the Special Committee for Phanerogamae and Pteridophyta (see op. cit. 358, 381).

The three names proposed here for conservation are not included in the list referred to above, as they were not used by Bentham and Hooker, but they have been generally accepted by most recent authors, including Engler & Gilg, and they would be the correct names for the three families if each of them were not antedated by an older validly published and correctly formed name. Like these three, a number of other family names proposed by Horaninov have been entirely overlooked and have been credited to later authors, as Myricaceae, Juglandaceae, Calycanthaceae, Loganiaceae, Scrophulariaceae, and others.

Moraceae Lindley, Veg. Kingd. 266 (1846), sensu stricto. — Bureau in De Candolle, Prodr. 17: 211 (1873), sensu stricto. — Engler in Nat. Pflanzenfam. III. 1: 66 (1889). — Nakai, Fl. Sylv. Kor. 19: 90 (1933), with many synonyms. — Nomen conservandum

versus

Artocarpaceae Horaninov, Prim. Lin. Syst. Nat. 62 (1834). — Lindley, Veg. Kingd. 269 (1846), sensu stricto. — Bureau in De Candolle, Prodr. 17: 280 (1873), sensu stricto.

Urticeae ord. II. Artocarpeae De Candolle in Lamarck & De Candolle, Fl. Franç. ed. 3, 3: 318 (1805).

Urticeae Agardh, Aphor. Bot. 203 (1825), p. p.

Moreae Endlicher, Prodr. Fl. Norfolk. 40 (1833), nom.; Gen. Pl. 277 (1836).

Urticaceae 1. Artocarpeae Reichenbach, Handb. Nat. Pflanzensyst. 172 (1837), nom. subnud.

Urticaceae subord. Moreae Gray, Bot. Text-book, 356 (1842).

Urticaceae subfam. Ficeae Presl, Wšeob. Rostl. 2: 1365 (1846).

Moraceae subfam. Moroideae et Artocarpoideae A. Braun in Ascherson, Fl. Prov. Brandenb. 1: 57 (1864).

As the name Moraceae has been used by all authors who considered the family distinct from Urticaceae, it seems advisable to conserve it for that important family, which includes a number of genera of great economic importance. The name Artocarpaceae Horan. (emend.) would then be valid only as the name of a separate family distinct from Moraceae, as used by Lindley in 1846 and by Bureau in 1873: in his original concept Horaninov used the name in a wider sense, including *Morus* and related genera.

Hippocastanaceae Torrey & Gray, Fl. N. Am. 1: 250 (1838). — Pax in Nat. Pflanzen-fam. III. 5: 273 (1895). — Nomen conservandum versus

Paviaceae Horaninov, Prim. Lin. Syst. Nat. 100 (1834).

Sapindaceae Jussieu in Ann. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 18: 476 (1811), p. p.

Hippocastaneae De Candolle[Théor. Élém. Bot., ed. 2, 44 (1819) "Hippocastanées"]; Prodr. 1: 597 (1824).

Castaneaceae Link, Enum. Pl. Hort. Berol. 1:354 (1821), nom. subnud.; a name apparently based on Castanea, though not in the sense of Miller; it is not cited by Link as one of the constituent genera.

Sapindaceae 3. Sapindeae a. Hippocastaneae Reichenbach, Handb. Nat. Pflanzensyst. 285 (1837).

Aesculeae Presl (1820) ex Presl, Wšeob. Rostl. 1: 217 (1846).

Sapindaceae trib. Paviariae Horaninov, Char. Ess. Fam. Reg. Veg. 182 (1847).

Sapindaceae subord. Sapindeae Bentham & Hooker f., Gen. Pl. 1: 389 (1862), p. p.

Sapindaceae subfam. Hippocastanoideae A. Braun in Ascherson, Fl. Prov. Brandenb. 1:53 (1864).

Sapindaceae 2. Hippocastanae Drude in A. Schenk, Handb. Bot. 3,2: 390 (1887).

As the name Hippocastanaceae has been used since 1838 by all authors who considered the family distinct from Sapindaceae, and as the name Paviaceae, though validly published by Horaninov in 1834, has never been taken up, as far as I know, by any author, it seems advisable to conserve the name Hippocastanaceae for this well known, though small family, of ornamental trees and shrubs widely planted throughout the temperate zone.

Vitaceae Lindley, Nat. Syst. Bot., ed. 2, 30 (1836). — Gilg in Nat. Pflanzenfam. III. 5:427 (1896). — Nomen conservandum versus

Leeaceae Horaninov, Prim. Lin. Syst. Nat. 95 (1834).

Vites Jussieu, Gen. Pl. 267 (1798). — Lindley, Introd. Nat. Syst. Bot. 119 (1830). Sarmentaceae Ventenat, Tabl. Règ. Vég. 3: 167 (1799).

Viniserae Jussieu in Mem. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 3:444 (1817).

Ampelideae Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth, Nov. Gen. 5: 223 (fol. ed. p. 172) (1821). — De Candolle, Prodr. 1: 627 (1824). — Bentham & Hooker f., Gen. Pl. 1: 386 (1862).

Celastraceae . . . Cisseae Horaninov, Tetractys Nat. 32 (1843), nom.

Cissaceae Horaninov, Char. Ess. Fam. Reg. Veg. 184 (1847).

Ampelidaceae Lowe, Man. Fl. Madeira, 80 (1868).

As Vitaceae is the only name formed according to the Rules which has been generally accepted, while Leeaceae has not been taken up by any author and moreover is based on a genus not typical of the family, it seems advisable to conserve the name Vitaceae. Horaninov himself abandoned

the name in his two later works, making the group in 1843 under the name Cisseae a subdivision of Celastraceae, and in 1847 raising it as Cissaceae again to the rank of a family.

If one were to follow the proposal made by Sprague in 1922 (in Jour. Bot. 60: 69-73), the two last family names discussed would be valid without conservation as Hippocastanaceae (DC.) Torr. & Gray and as Vitaceae (Juss.) Lindl. Sprague brings forward the argument that the priority of a name of a family dates from the first valid publication of a name with any plural ending based on a generic name, even if it consists of the plural form of that generic name. In such cases the change to the ending -aceae is supposed to be an orthographic correction and the original author is to be cited in parentheses. Sprague's proposal, however, conflicts with longestablished usage and the very spirit of the Rules. The use of parenthetical authors is specifically restricted by Art. 49 to changes of rank of genera and groups below genera, and of transfers of groups below the genus with or without change of rank, but with no alteration in the name or epithet itself. According to that article, a citation like Hippocastanaceae (DC.) Torr. & Gray could mean only that Torrey & Gray transferred a family named by De Candolle as Hippocastanaceae from one higher group (ordo of Art. 12 and of Recomm. VIII and IX) to another. Hippocastaneae DC. and also Vites Juss. are not valid family names according to Art. 23; they have no standing, and if transferred could have no validity. Orthographic corrections or changes in the spelling of a name do not call for the citation in parentheses of the original author; they should be indicated by citing the original spelling in quotation marks after the citation of the correct name, or in a note beneath it.

In regard to transfers of names of groups above genera (see note on pp. 68 and 78), it would seem to be in the spirit of the Rules to make the citation of the parenthetical author obligatory for transfers of the correct names of subdivisions of families. This could be done by a proposal to insert in the second paragraph of Art. 49 the word "family" before genus, so that the paragraph would read: "The same holds when a subdivision of a family, a genus, a species, or a group of lower rank is transferred to another family, genus or species with or without alteration of rank."

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.